

A,  
CONT.  
a pointing device coupled to said function controller, said keyboard and said pointing device operate by sharing said function controller in said keyboard; and wherein said function controller is the only controller in said keyboard.

13. The input device according to Claim 12, wherein said pointing device is dumb.

---

**REMARKS**

Claims 1-13 are in this application. Claims 12 and 13 are added by this Amendment. No new matter has been added. Applicant respectfully requests reconsideration, further examination and favorable action.

Claims 1, 2 and 6-11 were rejected under 35 US 102(e) as being anticipated by Poisner. Claims 3-5 were rejected under 35 US 103(a) as being unpatentable over Poisner (U.S. Patent 5,943,506) in view of Brendzel et al. (U.S. Patent 5,706,031). Applicant respectfully traverses these rejections for the following reasons.

The present invention provides an input device for a computer system that has a keyboard having a function controller therein. Further, a pointing device shares the function controller. In the present invention, the USB controller is located inside the keyboard. The pointing device is thus, connected via the keyboard.

Contrary to the present invention, the USB controller 32 of Poisner is not located within the keyboard and accordingly, Poisner fails to anticipate Claim 1. Further, Poisner discloses a standard USB arrangement wherein the keyboard 34 and the pointing device 36 are both understood to include some type of microcontroller or microprocessor and thus, it is not

obvious to integrate the USB controller 32 into the keyboard 34 with the pointing device 36 sharing the USB controller.

Poisner specifically recites that: "Exemplary computer system 10 includes in particular USB compliant controller 32, USB keyboard 34, and USB pointing device 36, coupled to each other as shown." Col. 2, lines 60-63. Thus, the USB controller is not within the keyboard, but rather appears to be separate and may be part of the host computer. Poisner also states: "USB controller 32, USB keyboard 34, and USB pointing device 36 perform their respective controller, keyboard and pointing functions in accordance with the USB standard. They may be constituted in a variety of manners that are readily apparent to those skilled in the art." Col. 3, lines 58-62. Thus, absent a clear teaching otherwise, Poisner is limited to a well known standard USB arrangement which would include a microcontroller in each of the keyboard and the pointing device in addition to the USB controller 32 outside the keyboard. In fact, there is no detailed disclosure in Poisner of the USB controller 32, keyboard 34 or pointing device 36 beyond what is quoted above. Thus, there is no disclosure of the arrangement recited in Claim 1 or features recited in the other claims such as the wireless communication techniques, a dumb pointing device, the function controller being the only controller in the keyboard, the keyboard being recognized as a USB function, or the keyboard and pointing device being recognized as a composite device.


Accordingly, the Applicant respectfully submits that there is no basis for asserting that any of these features are disclosed in the Poisner Patent which is limited to the standard USB arrangement.

In addition, with respect to Claim 7, there is no disclosure in Poisner of the peripheral devices being recognized by the computer system as separate endpoints. Claim 12 has been added and contains the elements of Claims 1 and 9. This claim further clarifies that the keyboard and the pointing device utilize the same function controller that is located inside the keyboard and that the function controller is the only controller in the keyboard. Claim 13 further specifies that the pointing device is dumb.

In summary, it is respectfully submitted that for the reasons set forth above Claims 1-11 and new Claims 12 and 13 satisfy the statutory requirements for patentability of novelty, utility and non-obviousness in view of the references of record. Accordingly, early allowance of Claims 1-13 is respectfully requested.

Respectfully submitted,

SCHULTE ROTH & ZABEL LLP  
Attorneys for Applicants  
919 Third Avenue  
New York, New York 10022

By:   
Donna L. Angotti  
Reg. No. 32,679

Dated: December 11, 2001  
New York, New York

**VERSION WITH MARKINGS TO SHOW CHANGES MADE**

12. An input device for a computer system, comprising:  
a keyboard having a function controller therein for providing output signals for  
use in said computer system in accordance with a Universal Serial Bus technique;  
a pointing device coupled to said function controller, said keyboard and said  
pointing device operate by sharing said function controllerin said keyboard; and  
wherein said function controller is the only controller in said keyboard.
13. The input device according to Claim 12, wherein said pointing device is  
dumb.